UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,239	06/29/2006	Michael F Greene	20040138	9349

22500 7590 12/28/2010

BAE SYSTEMS
PO BOX 868
NASHUA, NH 03061-0868

EXAMINER	
DIVECHA, NISHANT B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2466	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/28/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/585,239	GREENE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NISHANT B. DIVECHA	2466	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 October 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 have been amended and are pending.

Response to Amendment

2. Objection with respect to claim 11 has been withdrawn in view of the amendments.

3. Rejection regarding claim 1-11 and 18-20 has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4. With respect to the double patenting rejection, applicant had filed a terminal disclaimer to overcome the rejection. Since the terminal disclaimer has been disapproved, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting

ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claim 1, 12, 14-18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/585148 in view of Lewicke et al (US 2010/0145163 A1).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Regarding claim 1, 12, 18, Application '148 discloses an apparatus for improving an ad hoc temporary incident area network by adding recording capability, comprising: an automatically configured temporary ad hoc incident area network including a number of modules coupled to respective transceivers for automatically establishing interoperability between the transceivers by converting signals from the transceiver to a common frequency and a common format, a sensor within at least one module for providing situational awareness data; means at each module for uploading recorded data over the temporary incident area network to at least one node on said network; and, storage at said node operably connected to said network for storing all the data transmitted over said network, thus to provide a complete stored history of the incident for which the temporary incident area network is established, thereby to provide redundancy for the recording performed at each of said modules and permitting readout of said recorded data for enhancing incident response (see claim 1) but fails to disclose a recorder within each of said modules for recording data obtained at each of said modules, said at least one

module collecting and recording situational awareness data from the associated sensor using said recorder.

However, Lewicke discloses a module comprising a sensor and memory (recorder) wherein the sensor senses the data and further stores (records) the data in the memory (see paragraph 0018).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a local memory for storing data that has been captured by the sensor.

The motivation for doing so would be collect a set of data for a predetermined time such that the bandwidth could be saved.

Regarding claim 14, Application 148 discloses a method of and further including the step of providing an incident commander terminal having a display at the node at which the data is stored and reading out the stored data at the incident commander terminal to the display to provide situational awareness for permitting the incident commander to assess the response to the incident and to further direct the first responders based on an analysis of the stored data (claim 6).

Regarding claim 15, Application 148 discloses a method wherein the recorded data is taken from the group consisting of audio communications, image data, sensor data and location data (claim 1).

Regarding claim 16, Application 148 discloses a method and further including the step of overlaying the displayed data with a map of the incident area and superimposing the position of first responders on the map (claim 7).

Regarding claim 17, Application 148 discloses a method wherein the sensor is taken from the group consisting of position sensors, air quality sensors, radiation sensors, temperature sensors, oxygen tank sensors, biometrie sensors and HAZMAT sensors (claim 5).

7. Claim 2-7, 13, 19-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/585148 in view of Lewicke et al (US 2010/0145163 A1), and further in view of Israel. (USP 6600501).

Regarding claim 2, Application 148 fails to disclose an apparatus wherein each portion of recorded data is time- stamped and wherein the time-stamped data is recorded at the storage at said node in the order in which it was received to provide a timeline-based stored history of the incident.

However, Lewicke discloses a method further time-stamping the data recoded at each of said modules, storing the time stamps along with the stored data (see paragraph 0018, 0042). Israel discloses a system wherein the events are organized in terms of time and further displaying a time line with links, typically a reference to a period, topic or event (see abstract, discloses a time with links of information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include time stamping the events or incidents when they are received such that they can be organized and rendered in a timeline as disclosed by Isreal to the teaching of Burkley.

The motivation for doing so would be to organize the events in chronological order such that an event could be determined.

Regarding claim 3, Application '148 discloses an apparatus and further including a terminal at said node for displaying said stored data (see claim 1).

Regarding claim 4, Application 148 fails to disclose an apparatus and further including a timeline generator for displaying a timeline on said display and for displaying recorded data juxtaposed to said timeline.

However, Lewicke discloses a method further time-stamping the data recoded at each of said modules, storing the time stamps along with the stored data (see paragraph 0018, 0042). Israel discloses a system wherein the events are organized in terms of time and further displaying a time line with links, typically a reference to a period, topic or event (see abstract, discloses a time with links of information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include time stamping the events or incidents when they are received such that they can be organized and rendered in a timeline as disclosed by Isreal to the teaching of Burkley.

The motivation for doing so would be to organize the events in chronological order such that an event could be determined.

Regarding claim 5, Application 148 discloses an apparatus wherein the sensor at said at least one module is coupled to the associated recorder (claim 1).

Regarding claim 6, Application 148 fails to disclose an apparatus wherein recorded data at the output of said sensor is transmitted over said network to said node for recording thereof, said recorded sensor data being displayed on said display juxtaposed to said timeline.

However, Lewicke discloses recording data before the data is communicated over a communication link to a second memory (paragraph 0018).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a local memory for storing data that has been captured by the sensor.

The motivation for doing so would be collect a set of data for a predetermined time such that the bandwidth could be saved.

Application 148 fails to disclose said recorded sensor data being displayed on said display juxtaposed to said timeline.

However, Israel discloses a system wherein the events are organized in terms of time and further displaying a time line with links, typically a reference to a period, topic or event (see abstract, discloses a time with links of information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include time stamping the events or incidents when they are received such that they can be organized and rendered in a timeline as disclosed by Isreal to the teaching of Burkley.

The motivation for doing so would be to organize the events in chronological order such that an event could be determined.

Regarding claim 7, Application 148 discloses an apparatus and further including a video camera at at least one of said modules having an output recorded at said module and means for streaming said video data over said network to said node for storage at said node (claim 3).

Regarding claim 13, Application 148 fails to disclose a method further including time stamping the data recorded at each of said modules, storing the time stamps along with the stored data, and reading out said data in timed sequence corresponding to the time of incident.

However, Lewicke discloses a method further time-stamping the data recoded at each of said modules, storing the time stamps along with the stored data (see paragraph 0018, 0042). However, Israel discloses a system wherein the events are organized in terms of time and further displaying a time line with links, typically a reference to a period, topic or event (see abstract, discloses a time with links of information).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include recording the data with the time stamp such that it can be displayed in the order that it occurred.

The motivation for doing so would be to interrelate the incident and view them in order of time they occurred.

Regarding claim 19-20, Application 148 fails to disclose an apparatus wherein said node includes an incident commander terminal having a display, and further including means for making the stored data available at said display in a timed sequence controllable by an individual thereat and further including a timeline presented on said display and means for presenting stored data that occurs within a given time interval associated with said timeline.

However, Lewicke discloses a module comprising a sensor and memory (recorder) wherein the sensor senses the data and further stores (records) the data in the memory (see paragraph 0018).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a local memory for storing data that has been captured by the sensor.

The motivation for doing so would be collect a set of data for a predetermined time such that the bandwidth could be saved.

Application 148 fails to disclose outputting the data controllable in a time sequence and further including a timeline presented on said display and means for presenting stored data that occurs within a given time interval associated with said timeline.

However, Lewicke discloses a method further time-stamping the data recoded at each of said modules, storing the time stamps along with the stored data (see paragraph 0018, 0042). Israel discloses a system wherein the events are organized in terms of time and further displaying

a time line with links, typically a reference to a period, topic or event (see abstract, discloses a time with links of information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include time stamping the events or incidents when they are received such that they can be organized and rendered in a timeline as disclosed by Isreal to the teaching of Burkley.

The motivation for doing so would be to organize the events in chronological order such that an event (such as an accident) could be determined.

8. Claim 8 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/585148 in view of Lewicke et al (US 2010/0145163 A1) and Israel (USP 6600501), and further in view of Parker et al. (USP 6996782).

Regarding claim 8, Application 148 fails to disclose an apparatus and further including an icon for indicating the presence of stored video data on said display juxtaposed to said timeline and a display for reproducing said stored video data responsive to selecting said icon, whereby the video data displayed corresponds in time to a time segment of said timeline.

Parker disclose an apparatus and further including an icon for indicating the presence of stored video data on said display juxtaposed to said timeline and means for reproducing said stored video data responsive to selecting said icon, whereby the video data displayed corresponds

in time to a time segment of said timeline (see figure 6B, disclose a timeline with images icons juxtapose such that the user can browse by selecting the icon for viewing).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include organizing the digital video data in timeline with icons such that the user can easily browse the data.

The motivation for doing so would be to make it easier for user to browse the recorded video.

9. Claim 9 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/585148 in view of Lewicke et al (US 2010/0145163 A1), and further in view of Brailean et al. (US 20090077601).

Regarding claim 9, Application 148 fails to disclose an apparatus wherein each of said modules records audio communications established by the corresponding transceiver and transmits the recorded audio communications over said network to said node, for recording in the storage thereat.

However, Lewicke discloses recording data before the data is communicated over a communication link to a second memory (paragraph 0018).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a local memory for storing data that has been captured by the sensor.

The motivation for doing so would be collect a set of data for a predetermined time such that the bandwidth could be saved.

Application '148 fails to disclose including a video/audio camera at at least one of said modules.

Brailean discloses a module comprising a sensor and a video/audio camera for capturing video and audio data and streaming the video and audio data to remote device (see paragraph 0012-0013).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a video camera such that are could be surveillance.

The motivation for doing so would be enable video feed enhancing the overall monitoring process.

10. Claim 10-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/585148 in view of Lewicke et al (US 2010/0145163 A1) and Brailean et al. (US 20090077601), and further in view of Artman et al.(US 20030069998).

Regarding claim 10 and 11, Application 148 fails to disclose an apparatus and further including audio unit for reproducing the audio stored at said node and further including a time line generator for generating a timeline and a terminal at said node, said terminal having a display, an audio icon on said display representing the presence of stored audio communications from a predetermined module juxtaposed with a timeline, and a selector for outputting stored

audio data from a selected module at a time corresponding to a selected time segment of said timeline.

However, Artman discloses a user interface application for displaying the events using an icon on a timeline where a user can browse the content through the time in an order that they occurred further the content represented in timeline using icons specifying whether the content is audio (see paragraph 0051).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include the timeline representation of Artman such that the user can browse through the recoded events in the order they occurred.

The motivation for doing so would allow the user to easily correlate events by sequentially browsing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. The factual inquiries set forth in Graham **v.** John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 1, 12, 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkley et al. (USP 7034678) over Lewicke et al. (US 20100145163 A1).

Regarding claim 1, 12, Burkley discloses an apparatus for improving an ad hoc temporary incident area network by adding recording capability (fig. 2, sensors) comprising:

temporary ad hoc incident area network including a number of modules coupled to respective transceivers (sensors with transceivers, as disclosed in figure 2 for uploading data) for establishing interoperability between the transceivers (see col. 4, lines 43-49) by converting signals from the transceiver to a common frequency and a common format (see col. 11, lines 48-57);

establishing an ad hoc temporary incident area network having modules that intercommunicate with each module coupled to an associated transceiver (see figure 2, discloses

field devices intercommunicating therefore, each module having its own transceiver such that communication could happen);

a sensor connected to each of said modules for capturing/collecting data or for providing situational awareness data (see fig. 2, devices like radio, sensor and portable computer are recorders since they record information and send it over the network; see col. 5, lines 20-30, discloses that sensors record data and provide the data to the command and control terminal; modules are radio/sensor/computer and transceiver);

means at each module for uploading/transmitting recorded data over the temporary incident area network to at least one node on said network (see figure 2, further discloses uploading/downloading information from the field devices to the portable command terminal); and,

storage at said node operably connected to said network for storing all the data transmitted over said network, thus to provide a complete stored history of the incident for which said ad hoc temporary incident area network is established, thereby to provide redundancy for the recording performed at each of said modules and permitting readout of said recorded data for enhancing incident response (see figure 2, 17000, discloses a storage couple through network for providing storage of data; see col. 10, lines 29-34, discloses a local database for storing logs of interactions among the portable command terminals; see col. 16, lines 26-48)

playing back stored data to establish what was happening at each of said modules in the course of responding to an incident (see col. 8, lines 6-19, discloses playing back of the storage devices).

Burkley fails to disclose a recorder for recording data collecting threat obtained at each of said modules.

However, Lewicke discloses a module comprising a sensor and memory (recorder) wherein the sensor senses the data and further stores (records) the data in the memory (see paragraph 0018).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a local memory for storing data that has been captured by the sensor.

The motivation for doing so would be collect a set of data for a predetermined time such that the bandwidth could be saved.

Although, Burkley and Lewicke disclose individually a sensor for collecting the situational awareness data (Burkley: see figure 2, discloses sensor for recording data), modules with interconnected sensors (Burkley: see figure 2, a computer is interconnected with the sensor) and recorder for recording data locally (Lewicke: paragraph 0018), they fail to disclose integrating the components together.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to integrate sensors and recorder within the modules such as mobile computer system, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. In re Larson, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965).

The motivation for doing so would be to provide an integrated system that can be deployed fast and easy.

Burkley and Lewicke fails to disclose automatically configuring the network.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to automate the configuration of the network, since it has been held that automating a manual activity involves only routine skill in the art. In re Venner, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).

The motivation for doing so would be creating a system that can be configured fast.

Regarding claim 14, Burkley discloses a method and further including the step of providing an incident commander terminal having a display at the node at which the data is stored (see fig. 2, portable computer in communication with the C2 system) and reading out the stored data at the incident commander terminal to the display to provide situational awareness for permitting the incident commander to assess the response to the incident and to further direct the first responders based on an analysis of the stored data (see figure 3, further discloses remote viewing capability and master system including functional specialist for reviewing and analyzing the data).

Regarding claim 15, Burkley discloses a method wherein the recorded data is taken from the group consisting of audio communications, image data, sensor data and location data (see figure 2, discloses a sensor).

Regarding claim 16, Burkley discloses a method and further including the step of overlaying the displayed data with a map of the incident area and superimposing the position of first responders on the map (see col. 7, lines 16-30).

Regarding claim 17, Burkley discloses a method wherein the sensor is taken from the group consisting of position sensors, air quality sensors, radiation sensors, temperature sensors, oxygen tank sensors, biometric sensors and HAZMAT sensors (col. 14, lines 65-col. 15, lines 21).

15. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkley et al. (USP 7034678) over Lewicke et al. (US 20100145163 A1) and Israel et al. (USP 6600501).

Regarding claim 18-20, Burkley discloses an apparatus for providing a replay of data collected from an incident in which a temporary incident area network is established between modules couple to associated transceiver, comprising:

temporary ad hoc incident area network including a number of modules coupled to respective transceivers (sensors with transceivers, as disclosed in figure 2 for uploading data) for establishing interoperability between the transceivers (see col. 4, lines 43-49) by converting signals from the transceiver to a common frequency and a common format (see col. 11, lines 48-57);

a sensor within each of said modules for capturing data obtained at each of said modules (see fig. 2, devices like radio, sensor and portable computer are recorders since they record

information and send it over the network; see col. 5, lines 20-30, discloses that sensors record data and provide the data to the command and control terminal; modules are radio/sensor/computer and transceiver);

means for downloading captured data over said network to a node on said network (see figure 2, further discloses uploading/downloading information from the field devices to the portable command terminal); and,

storage at said node for storing all the data transmitted over said network (see figure 2, 17000, discloses a storage couple through network for providing storage of data; see col. 10, lines 29-34, discloses a local database for storing logs of interactions among the portable command terminals; see col. 16, lines 26-48);

a display unit for reading out said storage to provide a replay corresponding to the collected data at each of said modules, whereby an incident commander can be provided with a replay of conditions existing during an incident (see col. 8, lines 6-19, discloses playing back of the storage devices via display devices);

wherein said node includes an incident commander terminal having a display and further including means for making the stored data available at said display by an individual thereat (col. 10, lines 35-51).

Burkley fails to disclose a recorder for recording data collecting thereat obtained at each of said modules.

However, Lewicke discloses a module comprising a sensor and memory (recorder) wherein the sensor senses the data and further stores (records) the data in the memory (see paragraph 0018).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a local memory for storing data that has been captured by the sensor.

The motivation for doing so would be collect a set of data for a predetermined time such that the bandwidth could be saved.

Burkley fails to disclose outputting the data controllable in a time sequence and further including a timeline presented on said display and means for presenting stored data that occurs within a given time interval associated with said timeline.

However, Lewicke discloses a method further time-stamping the data recoded at each of said modules, storing the time stamps along with the stored data (see paragraph 0018, 0042). Israel discloses a system wherein the events are organized in terms of time and further displaying a time line with links, typically a reference to a period, topic or event (see abstract, discloses a time with links of information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include time stamping the events or incidents when they are received such that they can be organized and rendered in a timeline as disclosed by Isreal to the teaching of Burkley.

The motivation for doing so would be to organize the events in chronological order such that an event (such as an accident) could be determined.

Although, Burkley and Lewicke disclose individually a sensor for collecting the situational awareness data (Burkley: see figure 2, discloses sensor for recording data), modules with interconnected sensors (Burkley: see figure 2, a computer is interconnected with the sensor)

and recorder for recording data locally (Lewicke: paragraph 0018), they fail to disclose integrating the components together.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to integrate sensors and recorder within the modules such as mobile computer system, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. In re Larson, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965).

The motivation for doing so would be to provide an integrated system that can be deployed fast and easy.

Burkley and Lewicke fails to disclose automatically configuring the network.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to automate the configuration of the network, since it has been held that automating a manual activity involves only routine skill in the art. In re Venner, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).

The motivation for doing so would be creating a system that can be configured fast.

16. Claims 2-6, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkley et al. (USP 7034678) over Lewicke et al. (US 20100145163 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Israel et al. (USP 6600501).

Regarding claim 2, 4, Burkley fails to disclose an apparatus wherein each portion of recorded data is time- stamped and wherein the time-stamped data is recorded at the storage at

said node in the order in which it was received to provide a timeline-based stored history of the incident and further including a timeline generator for displaying a timeline on said display and for displaying recorded data juxtaposed to said timeline as recited in claim 4.

However, Lewicke discloses a method further time-stamping the data recoded at each of said modules, storing the time stamps along with the stored data (see paragraph 0018, 0042). Israel discloses a system wherein the events are organized in terms of time and further displaying a time line with links, typically a reference to a period, topic or event (see abstract, discloses a time with links of information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include time stamping the events or incidents when they are received such that they can be organized and rendered in a timeline as disclosed by Isreal to the teaching of Burkley.

The motivation for doing so would be to organize the events in chronological order such that an event could be determined.

Regarding claim 3, Burkley discloses an apparatus further including a terminal at said node for displaying said stored data (see col. 8, discloses viewing of information collected through various systems and further see fig. 2, discloses a terminal with the storage for display of information, see col. 16, lines 26-33).

Regarding claim 5, Burkley fails to disclose an apparatus wherein the sensor at said at least one module is coupled to the associated recorder.

However, Lewicke discloses a module comprising a sensor and memory wherein the sensor senses the data and further stores the data in the memory (see paragraph 0018).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a local memory for storing data that has been captured by the sensor.

The motivation for doing so would be collect a set of data for a predetermined time such that the bandwidth could be saved.

Regarding claim 6, Burkley discloses wherein data at the output of said sensor is transmitted over said network to said node for recording thereof (see figure 2, further discloses uploading information from the field devices to the portable command terminal) but fails to disclose recording the data at the module and said recorded sensor data being displayed on said display juxtaposed to said timeline.

However, Lewicke discloses recording data before the data is communicated over a communication link to a second memory (paragraph 0018).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a local memory for storing data that has been captured by the sensor.

The motivation for doing so would be collect a set of data for a predetermined time such that the bandwidth could be saved.

Burkley fails to disclose said recorded sensor data being displayed on said display juxtaposed to said timeline.

However, Israel (USP 6600501) discloses a system wherein the events are organized in terms of time and further displaying a time line with links, typically a reference to a period, topic or event (see abstract, discloses a time with links of information).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include time stamping the events or incidents when they are received such that they can be organized and rendered in a timeline as disclosed by Isreal to the teaching of Burkley.

The motivation for doing so would be to organize the events in chronological order such that an event could be determined.

Regarding claim 13, Burkley fails to disclose a method further including time stamping the data recorded at each of said modules, storing the time stamps along with the stored data, and reading out said data in timed sequence corresponding to the time of incident.

However, Lewicke discloses a method further time-stamping the data recoded at each of said modules, storing the time stamps along with the stored data (see paragraph 0018, 0042). However, Israel discloses a system wherein the events are organized in terms of time and further displaying a time line with links, typically a reference to a period, topic or event (see abstract, discloses a time with links of information).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include recording the data with the time stamp such that it can be displayed in the order that it occurred.

The motivation for doing so would be to interrelate the incident and view them in order of time they occurred.

17. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkley et al. (USP 7034678) over Lewicke et al (US 2010/0145163 A1) and Israel (USP 6600501) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Brailean et al. (US 20090077601).

Regarding claim 7, Burkley discloses further means for streaming said data over said network to said node for storage thereat at said node (see figure 2, further discloses uploading information from the field devices to the portable command terminal) but fails to disclose having an output recorded at said module.

However, Lewicke discloses recording data before the data is communicated over a communication link to a second memory (paragraph 0018).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a local memory for storing data that has been captured by the sensor.

The motivation for doing so would be collect a set of data for a predetermined time such that the bandwidth could be saved.

Burkley fails to disclose including a video/audio camera at at least one of said modules.

Brailean discloses a module comprising a sensor and a video/audio camera for capturing video and audio data and streaming the video and audio data to remote device (see paragraph 0012-0013).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a video camera such that are could be surveillance.

The motivation for doing so would be enable video feed enhancing the overall monitoring process.

18. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkley et al. (USP 7034678) over Lewicke et al (US 2010/0145163 A1), Israel (USP 6600501) and Brailean et al. (US 20090077601) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Parker et al. (USP 6996782).

Regarding claim 8, Burkley fails to disclose an apparatus and further including an icon for indicating the presence of stored video data on said display juxtaposed to said timeline and display for reproducing said stored video data responsive to selecting said icon, whereby the video data displayed corresponds in time to a time segment of said timeline.

Parker disclose an apparatus and further including an icon for indicating the presence of stored video data on said display juxtaposed to said timeline and display for reproducing said stored video data responsive to selecting said icon, whereby the video data displayed corresponds in time to a time segment of said timeline (see figure 6B, disclose a timeline with images icons juxtapose such that the user can browse by selecting the icon for viewing).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include organizing the digital video data in timeline with icons such that the user can easily browse the data.

The motivation for doing so would be to make it easier for user to browse the recorded video.

19. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkley et al. (USP 7034678) over Lewicke et al (US 2010/0145163 A1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brailean et al. (US 20090077601).

Regarding claim 9, Burkley discloses further means for streaming said data over said network to said node for storage thereat at said node (see figure 2, further discloses uploading information from the field devices to the portable command terminal) but fails to disclose having an output recorded at said module.

However, Lewicke discloses recording data before the data is communicated over a communication link to a second memory (paragraph 0018).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a local memory for storing data that has been captured by the sensor.

The motivation for doing so would be collect a set of data for a predetermined time such that the bandwidth could be saved.

Burkley fails to disclose including a video/audio camera at at least one of said modules.

Brailean discloses a module comprising a sensor and a video/audio camera for capturing video and audio data and streaming the video and audio data to remote device (see paragraph 0012-0013).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include a video camera such that are could be surveillance.

The motivation for doing so would be enable video feed enhancing the overall monitoring process.

20. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkley et al. (USP 7034678) over Lewicke et al (US 2010/0145163 A1) and Brailean et al. (US 20090077601) as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Artman et al.(US 20030069998).

Regarding claim 10 and 11, Burkley fails to disclose an apparatus and further including audio unit for reproducing the audio stored at said node and further including a timeline generator for generating a timeline and a terminal at said node, said terminal having a display, an audio icon on said display representing the presence of stored audio communications from a predetermined module juxtaposed with a timeline, and a selector for outputting stored audio data from a selected module at a time corresponding to a selected time segment of said timeline.

However, Artman discloses a user interface application for displaying the events using an icon on a timeline where a user can browse the content through the time in an order that they occurred further the content represented in timeline using icons specifying whether the content is audio (see paragraph 0051).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to include the timeline representation of Artman such that the user can browse through the recoded events in the order they occurred.
The motivation for doing so would allow the user to easily correlate events by sequentially browsing.

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NISHANT B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is (571)270-3125. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 1030 am to 6 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Ryman can be reached on (571) 272-3152. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nishant B Divecha/
Examiner, Art Unit 2466

/Kevin C. Harper/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2462